

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 08/889,355 | 07/08/1997 | HEIDRUN ENGLER | 16930-000811 3379 | |
| 7 | 7590 11/06/2002 | | | |
| WILLIAM M SMITH TOWNSENT AND TOWNSEND AND CREW TWO EMBARCADERO CNETER 8TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 941113834 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | WILSON, MICHAEL C | |
| | | | APTIBUT | DADED MINDED |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | - | | 1632 | _ |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 11/06/2002 | 30 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| , | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 08/889,355 | ENGLER ET AL. | | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Michael C. Wilson | 1632 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 25 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a inal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in ondition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR RE | PLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 7 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in polyabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any arned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>25 October 2002</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be | ecause: | | | | | |
| (a) they raise new issues that would require further | er consideration and/or search (| see NOTE below); | | | | |
| (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE: | ing a corresponding number of | finally rejected clai | ms. | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | tion(s): | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se | | sidered but does NO | OT place the | | | |
| The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | ere newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 41-53. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is | a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapp | proved by the Exan | niner. | | | |
| ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 0. Other: | , | | | | | |
| | MICHAEL C. WIL PATENT EXAMI | SON (MU) | ∼ | | | |
| Patent and Trademark Office | | | | | | |

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303) 08/889,355



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicants do not correlate the arguments regarding CIP application 09/112074, now US Patent 6,392,069, to the instant application. Applicants argue the examiner incorrectly assigned Impurities II and III, but do not provide the basis for the statement. Applicants point to Fig. 23 and 24 of US Patent 6,392,069, which are not in the instant application. Overall, applicants arguments are not persuasive because they are based on structures not disclosed in the instant application and are not tied to the instant disclosure.